DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 282 HE 008 635

TITLE	The Study of Higher Education. Off Campus Doctoral Degree Programs and Evaluating Educational Benefits.
INSTITUTION	Association for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Mar 76
NOTE	84p.; Papers presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education (Chicago, March 6-7, 1976).
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Doctoral Programs; *Educational Benefits; *Educational Experience; Evaluation; *External Degree Programs; Graduate Study; *Higher Education; Humanism; Individual Development; Models
IDENTIFIERS	*Nova University; *Union Graduate School

ABSTRACT

The papers presented include: "The Union Graduate School Experience" (King V. Cheek); "Some Observations on the Nova University Experience" (Sebastian V. Martorana); "Higher Education and Human Equality" (Howard R. Bowen); "Benefits for Personal Development from Going to College" (Joseph Katz): and "A Contextual Model for Evaluating Educational Benefits" (C. Robert Pace). (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135282

Association for the Study of Higher Education

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

OF

ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

CHICAGO, MARCH 6-7, 1976

PUBLISHED AS DISTRIBUTED BY ASHE

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 635

THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

OFF CAMPUS DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

THE UNION GRADUATE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE
by King V. Cheek

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE NOVA UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE
by Sebastian V. Martorana

EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND HUMAN EQUALITY
by Howard R. Bowen

BENEFITS FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT FROM GOING TO COLLEGE
by Joseph Katz

A CONTEXTUAL MODEL FOR EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS
by C. Robert Pace

Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the
ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Chicago, March 6-7, 1976

Published as distributed by ASHE
ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

OFF CAMPUS DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

THE UNION GRADUATE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE
by King V. Cheek 1

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE NOVA UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE
by Sebastian V. Martorana 17

EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND HUMAN EQUALITY
by Howard R. Bowen 37

BENEFITS FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT FROM GOING TO COLLEGE
by Joseph Katz 58

A CONTEXTUAL MODEL FOR EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS
by C. Robert Pace 73

THE UNION GRADUATE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Dr. King V. Cheek

My assignment is to evaluate the Union Graduate School experience. There are four components which I deem relevant to understanding and evaluating the Union Graduate School.

1. The mission of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, which is the sponsor of the Union Graduate School.
2. The structure and philosophy of the Union Graduate School.
3. The clientele or constituency of the Union Graduate School.
4. The factors and process which comprise the quality control and evaluation of how well the Graduate School accomplishes its objectives.

Finally, we may wish to review some of the criticisms and alleged shortcomings of this program.

The Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, the sponsor of the Union Graduate School, was established in 1964 as a consortium of institutions committed to promoting experimentation and research in American Higher Education. The membership of the Union represents a broad spectrum of 31 American institutions of higher education, public and private, large and small, located in all regions of the United States.

The Union is unique as a consortium in that it is also a national university with degree-granting authority at both the undergraduate and graduate Ph.D. levels.

It is a challenge for institutions to remain both flexible and purposeful. This is the combination the Union intends. The Union holds strong beliefs in individual freedom, participatory decision-making, expanded opportunity and in the value of learning as an essential ingredient of human growth, dignity, and self-worth.

One of the Union's objectives is to develop alternative models and approaches for underserved persons--those excluded from the mainstream, as well as those whose needs are not served well by traditional campus-based programs.

Thus, the University Without Walls program at the baccalaureate level and the Union Graduate School at the Ph.D. level are two such alternative models.

I wish to emphasize that the Union does not deny the value of traditional approaches, but rather seeks to expand the number, diversity, and availability of alternative approaches to learning.

The degree process of the Union Graduate School provides an opportunity for students to pursue the Ph.D. degree in a highly individualized noncampus-based mode.

This program, which was begun in 1971, now has a current national enrollment of 650 students in five units. Its chief focus is learner-centered education which emphasizes self-directed/independent study and which utilizes a wide array of learning opportunities and resources wherever they may be found--traditional courses, laboratories,

libraries, the community, the work site, travel, independent research, specialized campus and noncampus based adjunct faculty and any learning procedure or human network suited to the needs of the individual learner. In this sense, students view the world as their classroom.

The degree process has nine essential components.

1. *Admission*--at which time the applicant's background, experience, intellectual capabilities and learning goals are evaluated.
2. *Residential Colloquium*--which marks the official matriculation of the student into the program and which involves the student in a two-to six-week encounter with faculty and other students. During this period, the student explores with others his/her plans, values and insights and developes with the help of the learning community a comprehensive degree plan or learning strategy.
3. *Committee Formation*--Each student has a committee or educational jury which counsels, advises and collaborates in the evolution of the learning plan and degree objectives. The committee comprises the student who is chairperson, a core faculty member who is keeper of the process, two adjunct faculty who must be specialists in their fields and two other Union Graduate School student peers. It is the responsibility of this committee to evaluate the student's performance and award the degree.

4. *The Learning Strategy*--This is a comprehensive statement or plan which describes the learning activities designed to fulfill the components prepared for the degree. It lists seminars, courses, workshops, selected reading, research and all activities which comprise the degree plan as well as a statement on how the student plans to engage in his/her own personal growth.

5. *Certification*--After the Learning Strategy has been developed by the student, in consultation with the committee, a certification session is held. At this time, the learning strategy becomes the official explicit agreement between the student and his/her committee.

6. *Postcolloquium Group Participation*--Colloquium members devise learning networks and sponsor interest seminars to maintain their interaction. Some of these groups are thematic, others are regional and often are not limited to students from the Union Graduate School. These minicolloquia provide opportunities for continued group experience and intellectual exploration. There are some instances in which they have become permanent cells long after the students have exited.

7. *Internship*--Each student must have an internship which is not business as usual, but is specially designed to advance learning and professional growth. Ideally, it affords an opportunity to link theory and practice.

8. *Project-Demonstrating Excellence*--This is the culminating student project. It may be a dissertation of the kind found

in Ph.D. programs of other universities. The concept is broad enough to include other types of products, e.g., a publishable book, a unified series of essays or articles, a project of social change or innovation, media presentation, etc. It *must* represent a significant contribution to our culture.

"If the project calls for scientific or historical research, the standards of excellence are those employed in other doctoral programs. If the focus is on an action project, the quality is demonstrated by preparatory diagnosis, ingenious invention of procedures, evidence for actual effectiveness and subsequent critical evaluation."

"Artistic creative projects must show depth of meaning, care in craftsmanship and genuine innovation. Something in the work should surprise one with a shock of discovery and insight. Scholarly studies should build upon, but clearly transcend, what others have previously done in the area of investigation."

Decision on the acceptability of the PDE rests with the student's committee.

9. *Terminar/Award of the Degree*--At the completion of the student's program, the committee meets and evaluates the student's work. Since there are no credits or grades, a whole program is evolved and evaluated and the decision to award or not to award the degree is based upon the total cumulative record.

Formative, rather than summative, evaluation is the key ingredient in the degree decision. Since the committee provides feedback and collaborates with the student throughout the project, failure at the terminar is rare. Deselection normally occurs much earlier. Thus, the terminar is both an exit review and a celebration.

The degree process of the Union Graduate School is only one of its important dimensions. In both, structure and behavior are deeply rooted value biases and philosophical assumptions about people, relationships, learning styles and society and education in general.

A brief summary of these values will help explain more of the character of the Union Graduate School, as well as provide a reference point for its evaluation.

1. *Learner-Centered Education* is the cornerstone of the UGS philosophy. The learner establishes his/her goals, rather than having them established by others. In this way, students minimize the extent to which they must constantly seek the approval of others. They are encouraged to understand the difference between personal success as defined by others and personal satisfaction which they define for themselves.
2. *Self-Directed Learning* is the process most likely to assist persons in developing concepts of themselves as learners, as well as forming habits conducive to life-long learning. The *learning process*, as well as the *content of knowledge* and its application are viewed as indispensibly linked.

3. *The Absence of Prescription* is justified because individuals differ so markedly in learning styles, endowment, previous experience, needs, interests and future goals that no uniform prescribed program can be appropriate for all. Although each program is individualized, there are constants in the degree process itself and in the expectation of academic excellence which should characterize the Ph.D.

4. *New Ways of Knowing* represent a goal of many Union students. "The urgent problems and tasks of our time transcend the boundaries of particular academic disciplines. Problem-solving directed toward social imperatives may draw on the resources of several disciplines, but must be sufficiently creative to develop appropriate methods of inquiry and application which may never have been used within fields of purely academic scholarship." New disciplines may emerge out of people's backgrounds, and careers. "Without neglecting the knowledge accumulated by research in each field, the creative scholar must have and cultivate the imagination to formulate new concepts, hypotheses and skills." Thus, the Union is committed to facilitating transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary study and projects.

5. *New Resources*--persons, organizations and events outside classrooms and campuses can furnish a new inventory upon which students may draw in promoting their learning needs. In this sense, the Union expands the universe of the acceptable inputs and participants in the learning process.

6. *Personal Growth and Satisfactory Life Values* continue to be the cardinal goals of doctoral study. They are certainly emphasized in the Union Graduate School's program. Indeed, the experiences students bring to their program are powerful variants in the design and execution of their goals. But candidates are not given a degree for post achievements. Their degree must represent a *value added* dimension in their personal and intellectual growth, as well as recognition for original contributions to scholarships, learning and society.
7. *The Concept of CoLearners* assumes that students, faculty and administrators, though they have different roles, may learn from one another. In both structure, formal process and behavior students and faculty as peers constitute a cherished value. In the academic program and institutional governance, students have a voice in decisions which affect their lives. They are chairpersons of their committees. They take initiatives in setting their goals and identifying resources and strategies and they also participate in decisions on admissions, standards of excellence, budgets and staff appointments.
8. *The Ph.D. degree* and what it represents are not redefined by the Union Graduate School. The Union simply provides an alternative route to its achievement. The same intensive exploration, searching, examination and scholarly research associated with the campus-based Ph.D. must characterize the

> Union Ph.D. The Union bulletin emphasizes that "candidates are expected to acquire a broad background of scholarship in their field and to do intensive intellectual work on some frontier of knowledge."

This summary of the Union's value biases is certainly not exhaustive. Any conversation with Union students and faculty would expand the philosophy. But these values do represent the core assumptions upon which the Union Ph.D. program is based.

A deeper view of the Union Graduate School can be seen through its constituency.

The students enrolled in the Union Graduate School are not the typical 22 year olds just out of college. In the main, they are older persons, usually in mid-career, highly motivated, capable of pursuing independent study and have a clear vision of their life goals. Most of them have demonstrated already that they are winners in their work and professional lives and have already experienced the integration of theoretical knowledge and practical skills.

Interest in the program is enormous. Despite a conscious "low profile" posture, the Union continues to receive in excess of 6,000 inquiries annually. Approximately 1,250 persons have been accepted. Over 350 have graduated and 650 are still enrolled. Students come from 47 states and 16 foreign nations.

As my profile of Union students suggests, we attract highly-motivated persons who have learned that they can learn beyond classroom and library walls, in both cognitive and experiential ways. Most have had experience in research, teaching, community organization,

developing educational or management programs and many interrelated areas which conveniently qualify them to assume power initiatives in programming their own learning objectives.

"They apply in large numbers because of the contrast between their experience, because of conflicts with other learning methods, because they have been turned on late in life, because they have a hunch they want to test out in the context of our learning network, because they have a social change vision, as well as one of their own potential, because they want to work across disciplines. In all candor, too, like many people, some are driven by the search for status and/or security. A few come with the view that this may be their last chance and they are determined to make the most of it."

They represent a wide spectrum of occupation. Our roster is replete with deans, faculty (some of whom have been "distinguished professors"), therapists, scientists and public administrators. One of our students has a national reputation in his homeland as a composer, as well as an American reputation as a researcher in psychedelics; another has more than one hundred inventions to his credit. A third is a former college president who is currently president of a major international corporation. One graduate publishes a major American magazine, while another is publisher of a chain of eight newspapers. One of our graduates did such significant community work in Mexico that she had a public square named after her! Many are leaders in higher education and community organization. Several serve as directors of University Without Walls programs; over fifty have served or

are currently serving on faculties of member institutions in the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities.

Looking at our students and graduates in very broad *occupational* terms, they represent the following categories:

Higher Education

Public and Private Secondary and Elementary Education

Community Education

Health and Allied Services

Therapy and Counseling

Free Lance (Research, Writing, Consulting)

Community Organization

Public Administration

Publishing

Theatre

Scientific Research

Design

Nearly 60 percent of UGS students work in some part of the vast field of education; the rest occupy a variety of posts in other fields.

The range of students' *areas of study* is broad. Students' major fields have included:

Psychology

(Humanistic, Counseling or group work, Therapy, other areas including theory, dream work, phenomenological)

Education

(Innovation or community-based, administration, other areas)

Humanities

(Philosophy, Literature, other areas)

Social Change

(Includes Women, Black and Spanish Studies)

Urban Affairs

Science

Other: Communications, Design, Anthropology, Economics

The success of the Union Graduate School should be appraised in relation to its objectives. The following questions are representative of appropriate lines of inquiry.

1. To what extent do students and faculty focus their studies on areas which correspond to the imperative needs of the present and emerging society?

2. To what extent do students and faculty acquire mastery of the resources of knowledge in one or more of the disciplines clearly related to their personal and social objectives?

3. Does the available evidence show that candidates awarded degrees have achieved the level of quality properly associated with a doctorate in their scholarship, range of information, depth of inquiry, sensitivity of perception, disciplined methods of investigation and their creative imagination?

4. To what extent do students develop and graduates manifest skills of leadership which our world needs?

5. To what extent have students developed philosophies of life which are personally satisfying and which motivate contributions to other persons and to social institutions?

6. To what extent do students as they work toward their degrees find the experience stimulating and rewarding?

7. To what extent do graduates continue after receiving their degrees, the kinds of exploration, study, research, personal growth and social contribution which they developed as students?

8. To what extent has UGS operated democratically, utilizing the potential contributions of its faculty, students and alumni to improve its own ways of working?

The Ph.D. has an honored tradition as the highest earned academic degree in the U.S. In every accredited university, candidates are expected to acquire a broad background of scholarship in their field and then to do intensive intellectual work on some frontier of knowledge. Our candidates are expected to master the relevant literature in their field; to know the current controversies and alternative positions; to write cogent and readable reports and to think critically on the issues. They are expected to make a noteworthy creative contribution beyond satisfactory performance.

Much of what has been said above about conditions for learning, relevance to changing social needs, developing well-examined life values, and operating along genuinely democratic lines could apply to a good elementary school, as well as to a doctoral program. The distinctive elements in advanced degrees are the superior mastery of knowledge, greater depth of inquiry, wider range of considerations, increased sensitivity of perception, more effective use of life experience, reliance on persistently disciplined methods of thought and investigation, and the significant contribution of originality and creative imagination. Students in the Union Graduate School, although they operate in many different fields, study with a variety of academic and nonacademic experts as advisors, achieve professional competence in many diverse internships and design unique "Projects Demonstrating Excellence." All are expected to exhibit the high level of competence associated with a doctorate. They must meet the expectations, in this regard, of at least two members of the core faculty, at least two adjunct professors specializing in the student's

chosen field, and internship supervisor and at least two peers who are aware that the standing of their own degree may be affected by the quality of the product of their fellow students.

Both individual and institutional assessment takes place at multiple levels and in varied ways. Students are assessed during the colloquium by faculty and peers, at certification and early in the terminating phase of the program by their committee. These three points of assessments are just that, formal times during which assessment takes place. In addition, the very nature of the program, its structure and design, encourages an ongoing process of evaluation by students themselves, their peers, core faculty and adjunct faculty.

The faculty are assessed by the peers and by students. In addition, various forms of colleague assessment are used. One of these is the recently developed procedure of having a second core serve as consultant to the first core in reviewing a student's program summary and project demonstrating excellence in order to provide feedback to the core faculty.

The program as a whole is assessed from a variety of perspectives. Students, core faculty and the coordinator are engaged in an ongoing process of assessment. The opinion of adjuncts and internship supervisors is sought out as regards their respective areas of program involvement.

In all the assessment and evaluations, quality control is emphasized as a major concern and is made an integral part of the program itself.

Perhaps the most powerful quality control agents are the students themselves. "The prestige of these degrees will be determined over time by the achievements of our graduates. As students appraise the fitness of their fellow candidates, they recognize that the value of their own degree depends on the qualities of others who achieve them."

The extent to which this attitude is reflected in the behavior of Union Graduate School students is remarkable. In the long run, it will be our greatest protection against any tendency to cheapen the degree.

Finally, I would like to briefly mention some of the major weaknesses and alleged criticisms of the Union Graduate School Program.

1. Although the Union is a consortium university, technically controlled and governed by its members, there is insufficient connection between the doctoral program and graduate departments of member institutions.

   --The process would not be perverted if administered from a graduate university campus. The positive import of shared resources coupled with the influence upon attitudes of traditionalist could be of value. In addition, the creditibility of these programs would perhaps be enhanced.

2. The governance philosophy and behavior create obvious problems as the institutions grow in size and become more diverse.

   --Polar tensions/Colleagueship--efficiency

3. Not unlike many graduate programs, we make some mistakes in admission and graduation.

   --Some students who should not, do enter--and others who should not, do graduate

   --The most we can do is recognize this normal phenomenon and strive to minimize the slippage.

The Union Graduate School is young and evolving. We will obviously learn much from and build upon our experiences. The validation of what we do will lie in our impact upon the persons we purport to serve and in how well we accomplish our mission.

The day may come when this educational model is adopted by some of the more traditional graduate universities, and the Union Graduate School may lose its competitive position and be replaced by those with greater resources.

When this happens, it will be a day of joy--because the real goal of the UECU is to be a catalyst for change in higher education. What better way is there to accomplish a goal than to develop programs which the rest of the universe adopts so that your energies may be freed to move to new frontiers.

This is both a hope and expectation as the legitimacy of this nontraditional process becomes more firmly established and accepted.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE NOVA UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE

by

S. V. Martorana
Professor of Education, College of Education
and
Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

The exchange of correspondence I had with Chairman Robert Pace, when he first asked me if I would be willing to be a part of this program, brought out a point that needs to be emphasized at the outset of this presentation. In his initial letter of invitation, Dr. Pace asked me if I would be willing to be a part of this panel and to make a presentation on the topic, "An Evaluation of the Nova University Experience." My reply was that I would be very happy to be a part of the program, which discussed open university approaches in higher education today, but I would not wish to have my participation billed as making an evaluation of Nova University. This position was expressed because I felt the suggestion that an evaluation of a program as complex and far reaching as Nova's might be accomplished in a single brief paper would be presumptuous in the extreme. Furthermore, it seemed to me the audience present might be better served by having a commentary made that was more directed to being informational and to stimulating discussion, rather than a report of judgments already made. Accordingly, my presentation will seek neither to defend

nor to attack the approach to an open university doctoral program that Nova University is attempting; hopefully, it will serve to illuminate some of the issues that are raised by this approach to the doctorate in education and to provoke some further examination of its strengths and weaknesses.

Another point to be made early is that my observations on the Nova University experience will relate only to the doctorate in education offered for community college personnel. As I will point out later in the paper, Nova University offers a number of other academic programs, both in the conventional and in the external mode. I will make no comment about these programs other than to mention them to show the broader university setting in which the doctorate in education for community college personnel operates.

Professorial Interest in the Nova Experience

Why is an assemblage of the Association of Professors of Higher Education interested in the Nova University experience? Why should it be? A meaningful discussion of these questions, raised at the start of this presentation, will serve to set a context for the observations to be made later about the Nova University program for community college faculty and administrators. There are several reasons, one can suspect, why professors of higher education are interested in the program. Some of these reasons may be classed as positive; for example, a wish to know something about a new development in the field that promises added services by higher education to its constituency; a wish to capitalize on the constructive features of

such a program, or to avoid pitfalls it has shown; an interest in seeing new research and development and new lines of scholarly interest in questions the program raises. Other reasons, more indicative of negative motives, may also be identified: a hope that an innovation believed to be threatening to the *status quo* may be found weak, ineffective, and doomed to fail; an interest in finding points of vulnerability which can be attacked, and so the failure of the innovation hastened; and perhaps even worse, a wish to find some point to ridicule and deride in that which is new and different in higher education--a field which is essentially conservative.

Very likely, both those individuals who come to this discussion with positive interest in the Nova experience and those negatively inclined will be served somewhat by the observations to follow, and because this is so, both groups will also be somewhat disappointed. But before moving to observations concerning the Nova experience, the second of the two questions just posed needs some further reply. Whether or not they are in fact attracted to the discussion by positive or negative inclinations toward its presence in the field, why *should* a group of professors of higher education be interested in the Nova experience? A long list of reasons might be developed, but only two need comment here: (a) first, and most critical, because of the traditional role of the university to provide for the society it serves the full corps of personnel who must have advanced, specialized education and training, and who are essential to the society if it is to function effectively; and (b) because of the special innovative approach and methodology that Nova University is using in its move to accomplish this traditional university function.

Time prohibits full development of the first reason, but it is vital to an adequate appreciation of the Nova University program for community college personnel. The essential fact to note in this regard is that within the general field of teaching as a profession, there is clear evidence that a new subset professional group has emerged: this new professional group is the one engaged in teaching in community colleges and other postsecondary educational institutions which share some of the same purposes as are set typically for community colleges. There are no truly accurate statistics to describe the group sharply, but some 200,000 to 250,000 can be found today in the 1,000 or more public, comprehensive community colleges alone. These teachers are *not* typical university professors, nor are they typical high school teachers; they are a new breed of professionals in post-secondary education, deeply immersed in the instructional services provided by the institutions in which they work and intensely committed to generating improvements in this academic function.

My point here is not simply to identify the new segment of the core of specialized talent needed by the society (as exemplified by at least the 1,000 public comprehensive community colleges, and the localities they serve); my point is that the nation's universities are the responsible agency to produce this group of trained personnel, just as they are the responsible source of supply for all of the others that could be named--physicians, lawyers, agriculturalists, accountants, engineers, and so on. Faculty for postsecondary educational institutions of the community college type are needed and should be prepared by the universities.

All of us here know well the great reluctance the universities typically express against accepting the proposition that a new profession calling for specialized advanced talent is being born. It took teaching as a profession a hundred years to make the grade and some argue it has not fully happened yet. It took the enlightened insight of Morrill (and an act of Congress to create an entire new class of institutions, which ultimately became universities themselves) to bring many specialities in agriculture and the technologically-based industries into the professions and recognized as meriting university-level education and training. But Robert Hutchins and others who long have argued against the university as the center to produce professional personnel, as well as to do research and provide related scholarly public service, to the contrary not withstanding, there can be no questioning that the function is fully accepted by all major universities in the nation today. The observations made by Peter Drucker about "knowledge workers" in his very provocative volume, *The Age of Discontinuity*, provides an excellent rationale for a deepening and strengthening of university commitments in this regard.

That established graduate school universities are exhibiting some reluctance to serve the community college personnel needs, and pointedly, is no secret. A major national conference on community colleges and graduate education made this a matter of concentrated attention and discussion in the fall of 1974. The conclusion generally reached was that while the future may be better, the present was not very reassuring to community college interests.

A Brief Word About Nova University

At this point it may be helpful to present briefly a description of Nova University as a total institution. This may aid to develop a better understanding of the doctoral program for community college personnel, by bringing out that while this particular program and several others offered are presented in the external mode, the university by no means is characterized only by these kinds of programs.

Nova University, headquartered at Fort Lauderdale, Florida, operates both campus-based graduate, and undergraduate, as well as external noncampus-based graduate programs. This year, the total enrollment of the University was over 4,600 students. On its main campus it operates a law school, and offers Masters of Science degrees in behavioral sciences and in education, a Ph.D. in microbiology, and a Ph.D. in physical oceanography. Some distance from its main campus in south Florida but operating in the conventional campus mode is a program in criminal justice leading to the Master of Arts degree. The University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Nova also operates three external degree programs all leading to the doctorate. The one for community college professional staff to which this paper is particularly directed is one; another is for educational leaders in public school systems, and a third is in public administration.

When one reads the publications that come to his attention, when on the mailing list to receive internal informational materials,

as well as matters prepared for general publicity purposes, he must be impressed by the fact that in many respects Nova University is much like any other institution operating under private auspices and seeking to find its place among the established institutions. Nova's newsletter, the college newspaper, and similar publications, announce, like all the universities, faculty acquisitions and in doing so, like any other university, make much of the faculty's prominence in their academic field and their achievements in research, scholarship, and public service. The University, in talking about its campus programs, emphasizes the quality of their instructional resources and their commitment to excellence in serving the student and the broader society. But there is also evidence in the informational items about Nova University of a persistent and strong commitment to try out new ideas. The evidence of this continuing commitment to innovation merits the attention of persons such as are in this audience. The commitment started when Nova was established in 1967 and continues in the present.

Experience With the Nova Community College Leadership Program

So, with this background in mind, we can now turn to the Nova University experience related to the community college leadership program and state the first of two major observations about it. This is that the Nova program is serving to dramatize the emergence of a new identifiable and important subset of the teaching profession to which I alluded earlier. To be sure, a fair number of other universities over the nation have established programs to train community college professional personnel. This they are doing largely in the conventional mode. The Pennsylvania State University, my own, is one

of these. Some 85 persons who are members of the Association of Professors of Higher Education are also dues-paying members of the Council of Universities and Colleges affiliated with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; the Council is a body representing the professors of community college education. But few, if any, of the programs based at the longer established university centers have served to dramatize the professional needs of the community college faculty members as strikingly as the Nova program. By giving it special, singular, as well as different attention in the way the program is identified and resources provided to support it, the Nova venture matches the Kellogg Community College Leadership Training Program of the late 1960s which dramatized so well the need for special university-based programs for community college administrators, and which responded to that need so well. (Incidentally, it may be worth reminding some of you here in this audience, for the record at this point, that an effort was made about three years ago, just about the time that Nova was beginning to organize its program, to get the Kellogg Foundation to support a proposition that an in-service and pre-service program for community college faculty might be launched on an interinstitutional nation-wide basis. That effort failed. One wonders now, had it been funded, how the discussion this evening would have been turned.)

But back to the Nova experience. The program leading to the Ed.D. degree extends over a three-year period. Students are organized in clusters located throughout the country and bringing together members of professional staffs of community colleges. Each cluster

is headed by a coordinator, who already has a doctorate and is otherwise deemed qualified to provide general on-site administrative and coordinative support to the cluster's needs. The academic program projected for students in the clusters is organized in modules, encompassing in total six broad areas of subject matter. Three modules are projected for each of the first two years of the program. Persons of established reputation in community college education in the subject matter area of a particular module are brought to the clusters as national lecturers. Following completion of the lecture series on each module, the students are expected to accomplish practicums in the area; practicums are to be problem-oriented and to generate real services of an institutional research type for the institutions in which the students are employed. The third year is devoted to the accomplishment of a major applied research project. This task again is expected to have direct application and serve to help in the institutional development of the employing institution. The projects are carried forward under the guidance of a committee of from three to four persons. The principal advisor must be a person with experience in supervising projects of this type at the doctoral level; a second person or possibly two others are employed from personnel operating in the field; and the final member of the committee is a member of the central Nova University staff working in the community leadership program. Finally, to be noted, the students must attend, each year, a summer institute conducted near the main campus of the University. The institute is an intensive workshop experience

bringing together persons of prominent reputation in community college education and the active students in the clusters.

In just a few years, since the program began in 1972, the community college program has developed 42 clusters. None has shut down for any reason other than program completion. To date, 172 graduates have completed the doctorate through this program. At the present time, 35 clusters are operating with some 950 students enrolled. Statistics provided by Nova University indicate that 50 percent of the students enrolled graduate in the regular sequence of the three year program as planned; and by the end of three and a half years of participation in the program, 60 percent of the students who enter it complete it.

The program is operating in 31 states, Florida having 9 clusters in it, and California 8. The program has been formally reviewed and approved by official agencies in Pennsylvania and Illinois, and is currently under review in others. It was also presented for review and approval by the New York State Department of Education, the administrative arm of the New York Board of Regents, which is responsible for registration of academic programs in that state. The reviewing unit within the New York State Education Department reported affirmatively on the Nova program but the University withdrew its application before the Regents acted on it because of word that the Regents had adopted a new policy of not approving any new doctoral programs in education, whether offered by external universities or others.

The second major observation about the Nova community college program, to be noted for purposes of this presentation, is that the

method established for the program is even more controversial than its purpose. As I have indicated, the purpose is to meet the needs for persons with specialized education and training, evident in institutions of the community college type. Yet both the purpose and the method raise important issues to discuss. Both are of special noteworthiness to professors of higher education. The method is a variation of the "open university," nontraditional model, featuring the bringing of opportunity to earn an advanced degree to the student's residence base instead of bringing the student to the university campus base. As all here know well, this is not the accepted method for discharging the university's role of producing specialized personnel needing advanced education and training. The widespread and general interest that the method is generating in the higher educational community is evident in that it prompted this evening's discussion program, for the Antioch program is a similar methodological model. It is about this method, I suspect, that I was supposed to make most of my observations this evening. I will procede now to do so, but these observations about the Nova experience I would classify as minor in comparison with the two larger ones emphasized so far. Drawing chiefly on my own experience in the Nova program, but with some added benefit of conversations with others engaged in it, and with colleagues in higher education now involved in "open-university" programs, I can report observations about the community college leadership program. Whether these are positive or negative will depend on your own orientation, I am sure, so I will not attempt to classify them either way. The observations are based on my contact with some 150 students in

five different clusters operating in the '74-'75 and '75-'76 academic year. As an opening exercise in the first association with each cluster, I have made it a practice to ask the participants to give me some information in writing as to their backgrounds and their purposes for pursuing the doctorate in education, noting particularly their impressions of the external mode. The observations I would make about the Nova experience are as follows:

1. Students are established practitioners in the community college field and approach their study and practical projects from a perspective that emphasizes strongly staff and institutional development in the colleges where they are employed.
2. Students are pursuing their doctorates largely for personal, on-site professional advancement, not nearly as often for lateral or even upward mobility in the profession outside of their own educational systems.
3. The overwhelming attractive feature of the program is "the ability to get the doctorate while on the job at home."
4. Students are impressed by the features of the program which make it possible to become acquainted with "national" lecturers and with the prospects of practical applications of the results of their study. Universally, they express the view that persons brought to them to present background information on the modules provide for them a level of expertness in community college education which

is not matched in most other universities. This they claim, along with the fact that what they acquire by way of new understandings of their work in the community colleges, is turned to immediately practical utility in their home institutions, constitutes highly valuable elements in the Nova program.

5. An increasing number of states are examining, appraising, and reviewing the Nova program as it operates within their boundaries. It might be fairly said that no other program at the doctoral level is undergoing the kind of scrutiny that the Nova program in community college education is getting at this time.

There are some observations that must be identified that suggest that the Nova program for community college personnel is by no means perfect. It has some very definite weaknesses that can be readily identified and which I am sure are being given special attention by the responsible person in the central administration of the University. These observations might be listed as follows:

1. The library resources available to the clusters of participants in the program are spotty and varied from cluster location to cluster location. They range from excellent to poor, depending on the general library resources available for academic purposes in the locality where the cluster is operating and depending, very importantly, on the work of the local coordinator in aligning these resources for the use of the cluster participants.

2. There is relatively little interaction among and between the "national lecturers." This is not to say that there is none, for some occurs through correspondence and exchange of documents and through participation in the summer institutes; also there is interaction between persons serving as national lecturers in that the community college field in general is a friendly, somewhat close area of professional activity in postsecondary education; and the people who serve as national lecturers very much know each other and exchange professional associations in ways other than that afforded by their participation in the Nova program. It must be said, however, that the kind of interaction that would occur in the membership of a graduate department of higher education is not evident.
3. Resources, personal and organizational, to broaden the support of instructional help to the participants are limited. In contrast to the programs available in a campus-based graduate program, the Nova University program is handicapped in the limited ability to bring to the students' assistance the full range of departmental and other resources available to students to carry on graduate work in a comprehensive university campus setting. Whether or not the resources that are available in the comprehensive campus-based university program are in fact utilized is another question but the fact remains that in a program operating like the Nova program does, the opportunity

to broaden the instructional support of the student is limited by the very nature of the circumstance.

4. Protege-mentor relationships seem almost totally absent. In most graduate school programs it is a recognized fact that an important value received by students in the program is the opportunity to work closely for an extended period of time in a protege relationship to a person with established reputation as a scholar in his field. Opportunities to develop this kind of a relationship even within the major applied research project phase of the Nova program seems relatively nonexistent.

5. Some questions can be raised about the continuity of student experience and interaction from one of the lecture sessions to another. The clusters meet once a month for each of the three successive months to engage in discussion with a national lecturer on a particular subject-matter module, giving an entire day to that discussion. I do not have any hard evidence as to the extent to which there is continuity from meeting to meeting, but my impressionistic view is that it varies greatly from cluster to cluster and is dependent heavily on the work of the cluster coordinator. Having said this, however, one must be quick to recognize that the people involved in the program are employees in a single community college or in several community colleges operating nearby each other. There is a good deal of evidence to indicate that the people

in the program do in fact meet professionally often between the Nova sessions, although their purpose for association may not be a derivative of their participation in the program. Again, there is no way at the present time to judge whether this form of continuity is better or weaker than that which occurs in the programs of study carried on by students in campus-based graduate programs.

Some in this audience may question why the list above did not include the degree that the program aims toward and succeeds in the socialization of the students as a criterion. Socialization of students to membership in a profession is one of the usually recognized justifications for advanced studies in the profession. There were two reasons why this particular subject was excluded from the listings above: one was that this possible criterion merits special attention and the other was that it is a good point on which to close my iteration of observations. That a program of training for the professions in the university should serve a socialization function is not to be denied. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, one of our colleagues, and others have documented this well elsewhere.* With respect to the doctorate in education degree, the question becomes, however, toward what identity, that is, professional reference group and toward what kind of related behavior is the program expected to socialize the students? If the degree is in higher education, the position could be taken that

---

*G. Lester Anderson, Ann Bragg, "Journal of Education for the Professions: A Preliminary Study," Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, May 1974.

the degree recipient should be socialized to be "higher educationist." On such a basis, my observation of the Nova program would suggest a conclusion that it is not as effective a program and experience as the campus-based doctorate in education. As I have indicated above, the Nova program provides little or no opportunity for student interaction with other students and with campus-based specialists in the field of higher education; there is little opportunity for participants to engage in study and dialogue with specialists in postsecondary educational institutions other than the community colleges; and the orientation of the discussion and of their practical application again is toward the particular institutions in which they work, that is, the community colleges and not toward the broader range of academic institutions involved in higher education.

But here we need to note one of the opening propositions of this presentation that had special emphasis: it was that professional personnel in the community colleges were a special subset of educational professional workers, neither to be fully identified with university faculty on the one hand nor with public school professionals on the other hand. On such a basis, much can be said in favor of the Nova experience, and each of the points just made that were then viewed as possible negative observations now become positive ones. There is a high degree of student interaction with other students who hold the same value system; there is a high and concentrated involvement with lecturers and advisers who know, are experienced in, and are highly sympathetic to community college ideals and their achievement; there is a heavy direct application of the results of the doctorate program to improvement in community college practices.

Again, how many will judge this possible conflict of view one way or another will likely reflect their own views and positions on the issue raised. But we must not ignore the known fact that graduate schools typically do not socialize graduate students to the community college type professional practices. Joseph Katz and Rodney Hartnett make the point in this statement, "Furthermore, most graduate departments attempt to develop students to be images of themselves--people who will spend most of their lives doing research or writing scholarly articles. In fact, however, most graduate students find their way into positions that require other kinds of skills--teaching is the most pronounced example--and their graduate experiences do not prepare them for these kinds of positions. Worse, the graduate faculty convey the impression to graduate students that these other activities are somehow of less importance."*

Conclusion

I close then with a reference to a pessimistic view of the impact that external degree programs will have on higher education and my own belief that a more optimistic conclusion is also tenable. The pessimistic view that is possible is illustrated by a quote from Richard S. Granat, *Legal and Other Constraints to the Development of External Degree Programs*. It goes as follows:

> The existing mechanisms for regulating the quality of traditional higher education are breaking down as private

*As reported in "Graduate School: As Students Know It," in Wright Institute Report, Summer 1975, p. 13.

> universities and colleges threatened with financial collapse adopt the practices of the marginal proprietary schools. The advent of the external degree and nontraditional study programs blurs the distinction between "legitimate" degrees and "phony" degrees, making the need for quality control more urgent. *Our key finding is that there is too little regulation of higher education rather than too much.* What is needed is more governmental and accreditation association control over both public and private education if the public interest is to be served. The only way for innovative programs and institutions to gain credibility is for them to be subjected to rigorous analysis based upon objective facts. *Otherwise, they will suffocate as the traditionalists, operating through state education agencies and the accrediting associations mobilize to preserve the status quo.*[*]
>
> (Final italicizing mine.)

It should be noted, of course, that Granat and his colleagues are trying to suggest a positive reaction rather than a negative one to the emergence of external degrees and nontraditional study programs. However, the last part of the matter quoted suggests the pessimistic possibility that will in fact perhaps occur; namely, that traditional institutions operating through their organized authority structures may well mobilize an oppositional drive that will stultify innovation in the field. My own more optimistic outlook is that the "open university" cluster or satellite model used by Nova and other experimenting universities are having a positive effect on the more traditional campus-based university programs. In some cases, the effect is a replication at least of the essential elements of the model. Catholic University, for example, I understand, has approved this

---

[*]Richard S. Granat et al. *Legal and Other Constraints to the Development of External Degree Programs*, Vol. 1, George Washington University. January 1975, p. 7-1.

approach for a part of its Doctorate in Education and Educational Administration to be offered throughout the metropolitan District of Columbia area. In due course, therefore, one would expect that the good points of both the on-campus graduate programs and those offered through the external degree mold can be sorted out, recognized and, most importantly, turned to provide a better service to the student. In such a case both types of programs will be enhanced.

Speech at the Annual Meeting of the Association of
Professors of Higher Education
March 7, 1976, Chicago, Illinois

HIGHER EDUCATION AND HUMAN EQUALITY

by

Howard R. Bowen
Claremont Graduate School

One of the most compelling ideas of American society is that differences among people in income, privilege, power, and status are wrong and should be ameliorated. A reading of the Declaration of Independence or of Toqueville will tell us that the quest for equality is not a new feature of American life. But perhaps at no time in the past has the demand for human equality been so pervasive or persistent as in the present generation.

Education has been involved in the egalitarian movement in two ways. First, education has long been hailed as the door of opportunity through which the children of the underprivileged might achieve higher status. And it has been thought that over the generations, as education was widened to include more people and deepened to increase their learning, the differences among persons in competency would be narrowed and inequality of income, privilege, power, and status would be reduced. Second, education has had a part in fostering the drive for equality. It has helped underprivileged people to become conscious of the inferiority of their condition, it has given them

awareness of the inconsistencies between the ideals and the realities of American society, it has helped them to become effective in the political arena, and it has perhaps led them to believe that customary social stratification is not inevitable and might be changed. Moreover, education may have helped to motivate privileged groups as well to work toward mitigating inequality. It has acquainted them with egalitarian ideas, it has helped them to become aware of the objective conditions in society leading to inequality, and it has informed them of proposals for amelioration of inequality.

Recently, however, the belief that the diffusion of education would lessen inequality has faced increasing criticism and doubt. For example, it is often noted that the distribution of income has been remarkably stable over time despite the advancement of education. It is often alleged also that differences in social status, privilege, and power have apparently not noticeably narrowed. Much has been made of the fact that education through its system of grades, degrees, and other credentials performs the function of screening and sorting the population and consigning its members to various occupations and stations in society. Thus, it is said to be an instrument of a meritocratic system rather than an egalitarian influence. Also, it is pointed out that education is not a very influential factor in determining the future status of students. Correlations between amount of education and "success" in later life, when other factors are controlled, are not very high. Finally, it is argued that persons of the highest ability and highest socioeconomic status are the very ones who receive the most education, and profit most from it, and that

differences in income and status are if anything magnified through education rather than lessened. These allegations are not wholly consistent with one another, but they do present a formidable basis for questioning the efficacy of education in bringing about equality. They place the burden of proof on those who hold that education does promote human equality. One possible rejoinder to these arguments is that if it were not for education, inequality would be even greater than it is. But such a rejoinder is conjectural and less than convincing.

Inequality Defined

There are three kinds, or levels, of inequality among human beings. The first is based on differences among individuals in physical, emotional, and mental characteristics. The second is based on differences among individuals in their abilities and opportunities to contribute to society. The third is based on differences among individuals in what they receive from society in income, power, privilege, status, and personal satisfactions.

In this presentation, I have chosen to define inequality in terms of the third category; namely, differences in returns from society in the form of income, power, privilege, status, and personal satisfaction. The purpose of this presentation is to explore the relationship of higher education to the amelioration of inequality in this sense.

In American society, income, power, privilege, status, and even personal satisfaction are all correlated. The correlation is far from

perfect. Nevertheless, for convenience of discussion, I shall merge the several components conceptually into a single attribute, which I shall call *social position.*

Equality of Opportunity

The discussion of equality is sometimes beclouded by the failure to distinguish clearly between equality of *opportunity* and equality of *condition.* These are two quite different concepts, and there is no assurance that progress toward equality of opportunity would in any way ameliorate inequality of condition. Moreover, it is quite clear that equality of opportunity is far more easily attainable than equality of condition.

In considering equality of opportunity, one may begin with two assumptions about the human condition. The first is that human beings are individually quite different with respect to interests, talents, temperament, appearance, health, strength, and energy. These differences are due partly to their genetic heritage, partly to their socioeconomic background and partly to their unique life experiences. The second assumption is that within societies, people tend to array themselves into hierarchies or classes or pecking orders. People may be thought of as occupying places on a huge totem pole which they are ranked from top to bottom according to social position.

These two assumptions correspond to conditions as we know them in the United States and as they exist in most other societies. Given these assumptions, a population will always be arrayed from those of highest to those of lowest social position. For example, if any one

group near the bottom were promoted--if male blacks were admitted in larger numbers to preferred occupations, they would move up the totem pole. In doing so, they would move above others--perhaps uneducated poor whites who thereby would be pushed farther down. Or if some white women were admitted to preferred education and jobs, others, perhaps white, would by that fact be demoted. If educational, occupational, and social opportunity were extended to all or most people who previously faced discrimination or disadvantage, the result would be a general rearrangement of the population as to position on the totem pole. But in the end, the population would again be arrayed from highest to lowest social positions and the social distance from top to bottom would be as great as before. The process I have described is, of course, akin to Vilfredo Pareto's theory of the circulation of the elite. I would prefer to call my version of the theory the circulation of the underprivileged.

Equality of opportunity would change the relative positions of different persons on the totem pole. It would not necessarily affect the pattern by which social positions are distributed. It would improve efficiency by placing talent where it is most productive, and, more important, it would enhance fairness in the terms of competition. These are goals well worth striving for, but equality of opportunity by itself would not lessen inequality of condition.

The underlying philosophy of higher education has been meritocratic. Its efforts have on the whole been directed toward equality of opportunity rather than equality of condition. Its purpose has been to screen and sort people according to their abilities and to

develop talent. It has made considerable progress in overcoming discrimination based on factors other than promise and performance. It has opened doors to larger numbers of persons (but through its credentialing function it may have unwittingly denied opportunity to others). However, the net effect of its policies has been mainly to change the rank order of persons on the totem pole, not to change the social distance from top to bottom. This is an accomplishment of no small significance but it has not reduced inequality very much.

Equality of Condition

Equality of condition refers to the dispersion of people from top to bottom of the totem pole. With complete equality of condition, all persons would enjoy the same social position. And if there were inequality, the extent of it would be measured by the dispersion of the population according to social position. If the population were clustered closely together on the totem pole, inequality of condition would be relatively less.

For these reasons, some skepticism is in order about the possibility--or even the desirability--of seeking equality of condition. First, history teaches us that progress toward equality of condition is not easy. Most industrial societies have been characterized by wide dispersion among their people with respect to social position. Inequality of condition has a way of surviving even the most well-intentioned and thorough-going welfare programs, educational thrusts, religious and moral crusades, and even violent social revolutions. The inertial forces seem overwhelming and temporary gains have a way

of vanishing in the long run. The idealism behind programs for equality is usually no match for the forces of human avarice, pride, and lust for power. Second, progress toward equality of condition may be achieved at the expense of cultural and intellectual excellence, or at the cost of incentives needed for productivity, or at the risk of government controls that jeopardize freedom.[1] Third, objective changes in the degree of inequality may not be *perceived* by the population. People are highly sensitive to differences among them and statistically small differences can be the basis for enormous invidious distinctions. Indeed, status may be measured psychologically by ordinal rather than cardinal numbers. For example, if over time the difference in average income between the richest tenth and the poorest tenth of families changes from 20 to 1 to 10 to 1, the sense of inequality and injustice may not change at all. The "rich" are still comparatively so far ahead of the "poor" that the perceived social distance from top to bottom may still seem unbearably wide.

Though social equality may be elusive--especially because human beings are afflicted with the sins of avarice, pride, and lust for power--yet these same human beings have a saintly side which values brotherhood, charity, and justice. The egalitarian thrust in contemporary society is an expression of this side of human nature. It calls on the rich, the proud, and the powerful to share with the poor, the lowly, and the weak and it entitles the latter to press for

---

[1] On these issues, I commend the little classic by Bertrand de Jouvenal, The Ethics of Redistribution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

brotherhood and justice. And it calls upon all to seek equality in the faith that greater justice--both in fact and in perception--is possible, and that justice can be reconciled with cultural excellence, incentives for productivity, and freedom. The call is especially compelling for educators.

There are three ways to narrow inequality among persons. One is to *change people* in ways that will tend to make them less unequal in their basic abilities and traits and which in turn will lessen inequality with respect to social position. A second way is to change the perceptions of people as to what constitutes inequality and how it is measured. A third way is to redress the inequality in society by redistributing income and other benefits that are in the first instance unequally apportioned. I shall consider each of these three methods.

Changing People

Surely the most desirable way of reducing inequality is to change people so that differences among them in basic abilities and traits are lessened. In this way, not only are differences narrowed in the amount which people *get*, but also in what they *are* and what they can *contribute*. What people can contribute to society is surely as important to their social esteem and their personal satisfactions as what they get from society. To give really is more blessed than to receive. Equality is too often considered only in selfish terms of income status and power and not enough in terms of personal qualities and contributions to fellow men.

Genetic Changes. The range of differences among people might be reduced through control of genetic factors. Persons with known genetic defects of a crippling sort might be required or persuaded not to procreate. Possibilities may be opening up for "genetic engineering" by which defective genes could be repaired. There is little enthusiasm in America for pressing these methods very far, but some reduction in inequality by reducing the number of people with serious genetic defects seems possible.

Changes in Socioeconomic Background. The range of differences among persons might be reduced also by overcoming the crippling effects of adverse socioeconomic conditions. It is well known that family and neighborhood environments are a major determinant of traits associated with achievement. If differences in socioeconomic backgrounds could be lessened, inequality might also be reduced.

The socio-economic backgrounds of disadvantaged people might be raised by improvements in nutrition, housing, neighborhood environment, health care, and, by no means least, education. For those already handicapped by adverse socioeconomic background, compensatory measures could be taken in the form of special early childhood education, special programs for teenagers, adult education and job training, preferential admission to higher education, etc.

Efforts along both these lines have been made for generations, and have been intensified in the past two decades. The results are far from reassuring, partly because change among the disadvantaged is slow and partly because gains made at the lower end of the social

scale in education, health, etc., tend to be matched by gains at the upper end of the scale so that the overall degree of inequality remains the same.

To conclude that such efforts are ineffective, however, is undoubtedly premature. The amount of resources devoted to changing socioeconomic conditions has been inadequate in relation to the magnitude of the task.

The idea that millions of people can be changed instantly through crash programs with limited resources is patently false. Even with well-conceived programs and adequate resources, significant progress is bound to be slow. Success requires appropriate and diversified methods applied consistently with adequate resources over several generations. Progress should be measured in decades or even centuries, not in years.

Change through Education

As I have indicated, the efforts to raise up people at the lower end of the scale through education seem not to lessen inequality because people at the upper end of the scale are also advancing, and differences remain unchanged. It is probably true that inequality of education has not been lessened in the last few decades. But the recent past has been a transitional period and what occurred then was not true of the distant past and will probably not be true of the future.

The development of education may be viewed in three stages. The first stage was typified by the American frontier where differences

in education were small because almost no one had very much. The range with few exceptions was from illiteracy to fourth grade. There were differences, of course, in other aspects of socioeconomic background and in learning from the school of experience. But differences in formal education were on the whole quite small. The second stage, through which we are now passing, has been a period in which elementary education has been extended to virtually all the population; and secondary, college, and advanced graduate and professional education have been rapidly developed.

During this second stage, differences among people in educational level have become very great. The population is now arrayed from illiterates to persons with Ph.D.s and M.A.s, and with many persons at every intermediate level including elementary school, high school, and college. During the second stage the whole population has not been advancing together in educational level, one grade at a time. Rather, the educational level of young people has increased rapidly; that of old people has not changed; and the educational progress of some groups of young people has been much more rapid than that of others, the difference being related in large part to differences in socioeconomic background. In addition, immigration has brought a steady flow of people with little education. The result has been a very unequal distribution of educational attainment. In the third stage, which we are now approaching, virtually the entire population will have completed several years of high school, and a half to two-thirds will have attended college, and perhaps 10 percent will

have obtained some postbaccalaureate study. Thus the differences in educational level can be expected to diminish.

The trend may be illustrated in the following table showing hypothetical percentage distributions of the adult population by educational levels at various historic stages:

	0 to to 4th grade	5th to 8th grade	High School: 9th to 12th grade	College: 13th grade or above	Total
Stage I (1825)	80%	15%	4%	1%	100%
Stage II (1975)	4	19	53	24	100
Stage III (2025 or later)	1	2	37	60	100

Note that the data in this table are hypothetical. From the table, it can be seen that education was quite equally distributed at Stage I in that most of the population had very little of it; that it will again be distributed quite equally at Stage III in the future when virtually all the population will have a great deal of it; but that at present in the transitional Stage II differences in educational level are very great (perhaps near the maximum) as we are in the process of moving large numbers from lower levels of education to higher levels of education. The process of raising the educational level of a whole population cannot be accomplished instantly and must be carried out over several generations. One of the costs of going through Stage II is a widening of educational differences and of concomitant differences in social position. Little wonder that inequality is today a major social issue.

It may be worthwhile to examine data on the actual and projected distribution of the adult population by educational level over the period 1940 to 1990, as shown in the following table:[2]

	0 to to 4th grade	5th to 8th grade	High School: 9th to 12th grade	College: 13th grade or above	Total
1940	14%	47%	29%	10%	100%
1950	11	37	38	14	100
1960	8	31	44	17	100
1970	5	23	51	21	100
1980 (projected)	3	15	55	27	100
1990 (projected)	2	10	55	33	100

These figures show clearly the process of transition by which the population is changing from one of low but fairly equal educational level to one of high and also fairly equal educational level. During the transitional period, the distribution tends to be very unequal, this inequality being part of the process of moving the population from a generally low to high educational level.

Diminishing Returns

It may be imagined that the transitional process will go on indefinitely as more people seek advanced degrees and/or take part in recurrent adult education. But this trend is limited by the fact that

---

[2]Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964, p. 113; 1973, pp. 114, 117. The projections were calculated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

formal education, like any other use of resources, is subject to diminishing returns. As one's educational level is raised, the incremental gains in desirable abilities and traits diminish. This is reflected in the fact that additions to income, status, power, etc., do not continue as education is lengthened. Studies of the economic returns to education uniformly show that the returns are greater at the elementary level than at higher levels. The reason for this is that a person can scarcely function in our society without being elementary rudimists of literacy and "numeracy." But at each subsequent stage of education, the economic returns fall because the cost rises and the incremental benefits decline.[3] Diminishing returns also occur as a result of the extension of advanced education to more people. As more people receive college education, the supply of persons available for the preferred positions in our society increases and the salaries and prestige from these positions tends to fall; correspondingly, the number of less educated persons available for the less desirable positions declines and their wages rise. The result is that the relative economic gain from college diminishes.

One would expect, as differences in educational levels within the population become narrower, that the role of higher education as a credentialing and screening device for job placement might become less important. For example, if almost everyone were a high school graduate, and large numbers had college degrees, then these particular

---

[3]See, for example, Theodore W. Schultz, Human Resources, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research and Columbia University Press, 1972, pp. 29-30.

credentials would lose much of their significance for screening, and specific qualifications related less closely to formal education would become more important.

For the same reason that the growth of higher education produces diminishing returns in income, it may also produce less in the way of status, privilege, and power as the number receiving higher education grows and the fact of being educated therefore confers less distinction. The conclusion from this analysis is that if higher education is extended to more people, inequality will be lessened. On the other hand, if the spread of higher education is curtailed, as is often advocated on grounds that there are not enough jobs of the kind traditionally reserved for the college educated, then present differences in educational level will be maintained and the present degree of inequality will tend to continue. Unless the growth of higher education proceeds, the American dream of equality through education will have been effectively frustrated. If America is sincerely egalitarian, it will carry on the long tradition of extending higher education to ever-increasing numbers. To maintain the situation at Stage II would perpetuate present inequality.

Educability

A common argument against mass higher education is that only part of the population is qualified for higher learning. This is true but it is well-known that differences in "scholastic aptitude" are due in large part to socioeconomic background. Moreover, it is well-known that the percentage of the population with scholastic aptitude up to college admission standards has been growing steadily. In

several states, more than 50% of the 18 to 24 year-old population is now being admitted to college, and I have heard informed guesses that if further progress could be made in improving socioeconomic background among disadvantaged persons, at least 75 percent of the population would be qualified for college admission.

In considering the educability of the population, one must recognize that the percentage qualified will depend on our conception of higher learning. That conception has been steadily broadening as we have moved from a classical education characteristic of the 19th century to an education that encompasses natural sciences, social studies, many interdisciplinary fields, and many professional and vocational areas. The conception has been broadening also as we have diversified methods of instruction to include various forms of independent study, self-paced learning, internships, experiential learning, mechanized instruction, etc. And our idea of higher learning has been broadening as higher education has been made increasingly available to persons beyond the traditional college age, to part-time students of all ages according to their readiness to learn, to the circumstances of their lives, and convenience of time and place. There are possibilities of broadening the conception even further. Higher education is still largely centered on the learning of abstract ideas of a kind that can be expressed in written or spoken words. If greater recognition were to be given to affective as well as cognitive content and to the ability to deal with concrete objects as well as abstract ideas and emotions, higher education would be still further broadened

and would serve an increasing percentage of the population.[4] Personally, I would not wish to commend a kind of higher education which would encompass every conceivable human activity and interest. And I would argue that what we know as liberal education should be the firm foundation on which the entire ediface should rest. But I also think that an education designed in the 19th century for a tiny elitist fraction of the population could not possibly suffice in a system of near universal higher education designed for millions of persons of widely different socioeconomic backgrounds and widely varied interests. Moreover, an education designed for the transitional Stage II, when one of the main purposes is to induct many first-generation students into the higher educational system, and into the main stream of American society, will gradually evolve into a different system as differences in the educational level of the population are narrowed. It is of the utmost importance for educational policy to recognize that the present system of higher education is a transitional one designed for a nation that is moving from elitist to mass to universal higher education[5] and not a final form designed for a society in which educational levels are higher and more equal.

Inequality: Actual and Perceived

I have considered the possibility of reducing inequality by

---

[4]Cf. K. Patricia Cross, Accent on Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

[5]Cf. Martin Trow

changing persons so that the objective differences among them are lessened. A second possible way of narrowing inequality is to change the perceptions of people as to what constitutes inequality and how it is measured.

Actual inequality is measured by the objective differences among people in income, power, privilege, status, etc. Perceived inequality is measured by the differences as sensed by these same persons. Actual and perceived inequality may not be the same, and changes in actual inequality may not produce corresponding changes in perceived inequality.

Changes in the objective conditions will be of little avail in producing a greater sense of social justice or an amelioration of envy and division among people unless these changes are perceived and understood by the person affected. For example, if I have a sense of injustice because my prosperous neighbor receives income of $100,000 a year as compared to my $10,000, will I have less of a sense of injustice if my income goes up to $20,000 while his remains constant? If the "injustice factor" does not change despite the improvement in objective conditions, then the improvement will have achieved little effect in bettering the sense of equality. The improvement may afford me a better standard of living, and may be worthwhile on that account, but if it does not result in a perceived narrowing of differences among persons, it will not have produced a greater sense of justice.

Presumably, it would be desirable for people to be aware of the objective facts about differences among persons in social position. With this knowledge, perceptions would correspond more closely to the facts and changes in actual conditions would be reflected in

corresponding changes in the sense of justice. It would also be desirable for people to understand the implications of narrowing the differences among persons. Distributive justice is sometimes attained at a cost in the sacrifice of values such as freedom, economic progress, and cultural excellence. If this were understood, demands for absolute equality might be tempered, and people would accept some degree of inequality without a sense of great injustice. Education, especially higher education based on liberal learning, should contribute toward greater knowledge of the objective facts and greater appreciation of multiple social goals of which equality is only one, though it may also increase the sensitivity to small differences.

Perceptions of inequality will be determined by the number and variety of interests which are considered in measuring or judging differences among individuals. For example, if differences are measured in terms of a single criterion such as income, differences would be very pronounced. But if learning, moral virtue, religious commitment, sociability, talent for art and handicrafts, green thumb, patriotism, civic participation, athletic ability, mechanical skill, and adventurous spirit are all valued qualities in addition to income, then the overall inequality would be greatly ameliorated. When people are appreciated and valued for their tennis games or rose gardens or needlepoint or membership on school boards, etc., as well as for their incomes, then the degree of inequality is much less, and the possible conflict between equality and excellence is mitigated. The greater the number of dimensions along which excellence is measured, the less the inequality.

If education is viewed as a way of serving people of widely different talents, of helping them to discover their talents and interests and values, and of helping them develop themselves along lines compatible with their varied interests, then education can be an instrument for widening the range of human expression and reducing inequality among persons. A society cannot encompass every interest and every temperament; otherwise the society would lose its coherence and integrity. But the range of permitted interests need not be so narrow as to condemn large numbers of its people to the role of deviants or incompetents or second-class citizens.

Redistribution

A third way to reduce inequality is through redistribution of income. If the distribution of income that emerges from the market economy, presumably reflecting differences among persons in the productivity of their capital and labor, is deemed to be inequitable, the inequity can be ameliorated through redistribution of income. Redistribution may be accomplished through financial devices such as graduated taxes, private charitable giving, social insurance, public assistance, and public cash subsidies to particular groups. Redistribution may also be accomplished by providing low-income people with goods and services at less than cost or at no cost. For example, food, housing, health services, education, parks, etc., are often provided in this manner with the intended effect of redistributing real income.

The efficacy of various schemes for redistribution is often in practice disappointing because of side effects such as the shifting

of taxes, costly and uneven administration, legislative loopholes, use of regressive taxes to support social services, countervailing subsidized programs for upper-income groups, corruption, etc. Moreover, they do nothing about equality. The ordinal differences are the same after the redistribution as before. The intent is not always fully realized. Yet, substantial income transfers from rich to poor do take place, inequities in the distribution of income are ameliorated even though the degree of final redistribution is much less than usually supposed.

Redistribution is also intended to improve the socioeconomic condition of the poor and thus to bring about changes in underprivileged human beings that will raise their economic productivity and cultural status. It has been especially hoped that the redistribution will help to extricate the children of the poor from effects of poverty such as malnutrition, sickness, ignorance, and deleterious social environments. The assumption has been that if the poor receive more income, in cash or in kind, the result will be an improvement of their conditions of life and especially a betterment in the socioeconomic conditions that influence the development of their children. Redistribution through the delivery of goods and services such as food, housing, health services, and education is often preferred to redistribution in the form of cash transfers. The assumption is that these goods and services contribute to improving the condition of life whereas transfer payments in cash might be used for alcohol, drugs, gambling, etc. Education is one of the services that has long been subsidized, and indeed made compulsory, as a way of redistributing real income and of improving the socioeconomic conditions of the poor.

BENEFITS FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT FROM GOING TO COLLEGE

Joseph Katz
SUNY--Stony Brook

I. BENEFITS NOW ACHIEVED

A number of people have recently challenged the value of going to college. Clearly many things can be improved. But the research of the last two decades has also shown that there are many benefits. In fact, no one has yet demonstrated superior alternatives to college in the education of young adults. I will concentrate on personal benefits, not academic or economic ones. But my delineation of benefits to personal development is animated by the central thought that the emotional and intellectual factors intertwine and that optimally the growth of both is simultaneous.

I first would like to review some major benefits for personal development that derive from attending college--all of them confirmed by the research that many people, including myself, have undertaken.

1. There is a *decline in authoritarianism.* Between the freshmen and the senior years, students come to view the world much less in rigid, "black and white" terms. They tend to understand the hypotheticalness of all knowledge and the intellectual and moral validity of points of view different from their own. Their own commitments move from a more self-abandoning and worshipful submission to absolutist positions to a flexible investment in personal and social life objectives.

2. There is growth in *autonomy*. After alternating phases of defiance of and submission to authority, students develop a surer sense of their own wishes and a greater capacity for executing them.
3. There is growth in *self-esteem* and a firmer sense of identity. Successes in the tasks that the college asks of one give greater assurance of one's skills. The comparison with fellow students, at first often particularly invidious, leads to more just appraisal of one's standing vis a vis others. An ingredient and consequence of greater self-esteem is a more adequate relating of potential to expression.
4. The *capacity for relatedness* becomes considerably enlarged. From a more self-centered beginning as freshmen, students develop a growing capacity of empathy with others, capacity to work with others in groups, intimacy with a few. There is growth of the more superficial skills of poise and politeness.
5. *Political sophistication* is shown in greater clarity and understanding of the political and social environment. Thinking and attitudes now are not as easily overwhelmed by emotionalism, and a more mature social perspective views individual wishes in the complex context of social resistances and interconnections.
6. There is *humanization of conscience*. Standards of conduct are less invoked as weapons, to scold or defame others, or

as self-destructive or self-punishing devices to make oneself live up to unrealizable and often quite arid expectations. Room is made for a more humane morality and paradoxically for more genuine principledness in interactions with other people.

7. Hand in hand with humanization of conscience goes greater *freedom of impulse expression*. The college years have stimulated the imagination, brought students in contact with other people--teachers or students--with different ways of behaving. Previously "forbidden" acts have been attempted and out of this has come less shyness and hesitation and more expressiveness and willingness for further experimentation. Conversely, others have learned to control previously less manageable impulses.
8. Growth of the *esthetic capacity*. In and out of the classroom students are exposed to a barrage of presentations of the forms, shapes, and sensuous contents of things--in art, music and literary styles. Much of it is only partially perceived. But the general effect is one of raising sensitivity and taste.
9. Finally there is a growth in *theoretical grasp*. The patterns vary widely. For some it is more inwardness and reflectiveness, sometimes verging on sentimentality and conceptual emotionalism. For others theoretical development is more oriented to hard abstractions, mathematical or otherwise, clear definitions, systematic classification.

One might claim that the nine dimensions just delineated are maturational, and not due to the impact of college. Growth in these directions would have happened in any case. But existing evidence, admittedly incomplete, does not support this. Studies comparing college with noncollege graduates show the latter on the average consistently superior in many dimensions--not by as big an interval as one would like. It should be understood that different students make varied progress in the listed nine areas.

What brings about the development of the person under the impact of college? We have hardly yet begun to put together a systematic picture of the multiplicity of the effective factors. In one fashion or another they have been singled out here and there. Clearly it is not the cognitive contents of the classroom alone, and often not primarily. Even in the classroom, noncognitive factors exert a strong influence: the personality of the teacher, the personalities of one's fellow students, the manner of the discussions and the enthusiasm they generate, the ways in which the discussants treat each other, what they reveal about the students' and professor's attitudes and histories. Outside the classroom there is another multiplicity of influences: the residential arrangements--recent research has stressed the potency of residences--the "mix" of the student body, the varied psychological, economic, geographical, racial origins of the students, gender ratio; the availability of political, social, literary, artistic, stimulation and example on campus; the ease of access of students, faculty, and outsiders to each other, the groupings, meetings, and relationships that are made possible by

housing arrangements, the layout of the campus, the planning, spacing, and organizing of events; the apparatus of student newspaper, student government, student businesses, student sports; the culture of the campus, e.g., whether it emphasizes drinking, drugs, athletics, intellectual competition, bland gentility, etc.; the quality of the surrounding community, its offerings, the nature of its people, even the landscape; the outlook on what awaits students after college in the world of jobs or social setting. Such factors shape the outcomes, spelling a difference between mediocre and exciting education. Yet we pay little systematic attention to them.

There is one further factor that ought to be added to the nine previously listed. I discuss it separately because in some ways it is a mindless factor, "useful" as it may be for societal functioning. One important product of the demands for regular attendance, studying, examinations, grading is the development of disciplinedness. Outside of the army there probably is no device other than the large lecture hall to make as many people sit still in so organized a fashion for so long a time and to have them tied to rounds of expectable behavior in and out of the classroom over a semester's or year's duration. When one considers that often so much of the contents of classes are forgotten in a relatively short time, one comes to think that perhaps the enduring value of so much "education" is the fact that discipline is learned, *Sitzfleisch* acquired. Now discipline is a very valuable thing, but its value is considerably diminished when tasks are imposed, rather than connect with the person's motivation. The discipline often learned in college may have its utility for a society

in which much work is not really pleasant but calls for endurance for the sake of monetary rewards and for the production of goods that the society does not as yet know how to bring about through more humanized work. Colleges thus may be good preparation for people who will work in bureaucracies and live in row houses.

II. POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Having described what is, I now should like to proceed to what could be. I would like to begin with a list of six objectives for personal development--these resemble the outcomes described above. They are:

1. Curiosity
2. Utility
3. Capacity to work with others
4. Kindness--care--generativity
5. Autonomy
6. Capacity for enjoyment

These objectives are vital to personal development and, through the interconnection of the personal and the intellectual, for the achievement of intellectual skills and habits of mind as well. How is one to bring these objectives about? It is obvious that the multi-faceted arrangements of the college culture are a potent force for their realization. So can be counseling and even psychotherapy. But I would like to engage here in a seeming *tour de force* which in fact is one more indication of the intimate link of the intellectual and the

emotive. I will confine myself to the *classroom* as one avenue for reaching these *personal* objectives.

1. *Curiosity:* The cultivation of curiosity depends on at least two conditions: sufficient demonstration of it by professors and connection of what a student studies with what he or she wants to know. The didactic mode often enough detracts from the sense of discovery. Teaching is so much ruled by the principle of amassing facts, data, references that quantity seems to as much constitute intellectual wealth as a fat bank account constitutes material wealth. Advocacy of the discovery approach to teaching has often enough been made but the advice is all too rarely heeded, in part because the professor's experience of discovery of what he or she teaches is in the past and not sufficiently in tune with the state of knowledge, intellectual motivation, and available skills of the student.

   The cultivation of curiosity in the students would require more knowledge of them, more feedback from them, more willingness to accept less "perfect" statements from them, willingness to rethink the curriculum of the particular course, its contents, procedures, and sequences. It would also require more individualization of learning, more attention to the individual differences of the students in one's classroom. Moreover it would require a cultivation of the professor's own general intelligence and culture. Graduate training predisposes faculty to an emphasis upon specialty,

yet part of curiosity is wide-ranging intellectual interests and openness to discovery in other areas of thought and life. Such general curiosity where it is possessed by a teacher has an infectious quality for students. Because it is general curiosity, they can more easily share in it than in the professor's mastery of a small territory over which he or she has visibly gone many times. Generalized curiosity also is a way for the professor of staying alive intellectually more easily because there are always fresh materials. The wells of imagination and novelty may run dryer in a narrow and persistently focused range of inquiry.

2. *Utility:* Much of the sense of one's worth depends on being of use to others. Perhaps one of the more potent depressors of college life is the feeling of not being of use. Remedies can be found to enhance the students' sense of usefulness, for instance, by servicing the campus and off-campus communities in their ramified social and personal needs, projects serving the young and the old, the poor and the rich. Such projects can simultaneously be a powerful vehicle for enriching academic learning significantly.

There is the teacher of poetry who had his students teach poetry to elementary students in their district. Another teacher, a psychologist, arranged for his students to do a study of the people in the catchment area which a prospective psychiatric hospital was to serve. Another professor's students observed a drug treatment center for

adolescents. Courses in all fields which relate what is learned to a useful purpose are likely to give undergraduate education some of the vitality of experience that medical students have when they enter the clinical phase of their training. (How many such courses are needed is for experience to determine).

3. *Capacity to work with others:* Social well-being depends heavily on the capacity of cooperation in the dual mode of people assisting each other and of being able to unite against social or natural impediments to or attacks on their welfare. Yet the student career tends to be individualistic (though not individualized). The grading curve and the ways of the classroom and assignments tend to make his learning a solitary pursuit and the gains, those of competitive comparison with others. Yet we know that creative intellectual work often is the product of teamwork and other collaboration of scholars or scientists. Teamwork could begin in the classroom (as much as in some of the athletic endeavors). Almost any course could have more collaborative features built in. It may begin with something as simple as groups of students in the class reading each other's papers and critiqueing them (still leaving to the professor the ultimate grading power) or reading each other's examinations and commenting on these; professorial comments are often very scanty, if not nonexistent, and this would bring a student's products to the communicative consideration of peers. Even more effective

would be the formation of student investigative groups who in collaboration would attack a problem in the field of the course and write a collective report. We often complain that committee reports produce "camels" but that is partially so because our training for collaboration is insufficient. That two heads are better than one is also an ancient truism but not sufficiently acted on in our educational endeavors. Individuals should of course not be coerced into group work; some may need time and development of their social capacity before they are ready. Regardless of the extent of group work, I have no quarrel with the proposition that sufficient amounts of a student's work must be evaluated on an individual basis.

4. One of the conditions of *kindness and caring* is to know and to understand others in their difference. A means for cultivating this capacity in the classroom exists in the utilization of the interview and other forms of observation for the understanding of people and events. The interview can be a prime instrument to get out of one's own frame of reference and to translate one's self into that of another person, to suspend judgement, to follow the sinews of another person's thoughts and feelings. It is striking that we are aware of the need of paying attention to the skills of expression in writing (less of speaking) but we are not aware of the need of paying corresponding attention to the skills of listening. It is (or should be) notorious that even very advanced

scholars often misrepresent a peer's argument or reasoning. The professional journals are full of polemics based on such misunderstandings. One root is the lack of cultivation of the habit of listening, following another person's thought. So academic benefits, derived from the cultivation of listening, again intertwine with the benefits of an enhanced capacity for one's relationships with other people.

5. *Autonomy:* All the way through graduate school under the slogan of encouraging originality and independence, much instruction fosters conformity. The sequences of assignments, quizzes and exams, of predigested contents, in neatly arranged and graphically organized textbooks, the incentives of staying within the confines of the professor's favorite ways of thinking--all these favor intellectual mirroring rather than independent thought. Effective encouragement of autonomy depends on a massive exercise of independence, not just an occasional and perhaps halfhearted experience here and there. I would propose, for instance, that we include in the college program of all undergraduates the expectation that they learn the subject matter of at least two college courses by themselves; their competencies would be tested by appropriate evaluative procedures. They would have recourse to tutorial help though that would be put at a minimum. The emphasis would be on their own grasp of the subject matter. Clearly, such an arrangement could be abused too, and the evaluations could well encourage a conformity similar to that of the

traditional courses. But at the very least the students would experience that they can learn by themselves without the aid of a professor. (Note the special vitality often found in self-made intellectuals).

6. *Capacity for enjoyment:* We know from many studies and observations that a professor's enthusiasm is a powerful stimulus for the learning of his or her students. The professor's pleasure in the subject matter communicates to them and this means that a powerful psychological force--the pleasure principle--is working for, rather than against learning. (So often study, writing, or even research is considered a pain). Such enthusiasm of course cannot be commanded. The cultivation of a more wide-ranging curiosity about which I talked earlier might lead professors to greater liveliness of inquiry, even in their own field. Listening more to students and interacting more with them, receiving more feedback from them may lead to teaching becoming a more satisfying activity and hence suffuse it with more pleasure. Meeting with students beyond the formal settings of the classroom, inviting them to share in one's interests in and outside of one's own specialty may be another encouragement of the pleasure in learning. Sometimes making clear the esthetic connection of one's subject matter to art or literature can help vivify it. (Trying to enliven a course with slides is an often useful but dimmer approximation of that goal). The often harried pace of academia and professors, and the crowding of tasks are

themselves obstacles to the internalization and enjoyment of learning. Colleges have put much emphasis, not necessarily successful, on hard work and persistence. These are useful, but not by themselves alone because only when an activity also engages our pleasure potential can it fully command the energies and dedication of the person. Plato said long ago that compulsory learning does not stay in the mind.

I have outlined what at the moment may appear as some rather ideal goals for higher education. A more sober note is introduced by considering that an implied function of present higher education is to keep young people who cannot yet be integrated in the processes of the society in temporary holding camps and to prepare them for much rather soulless work that requires ability to conform but may offer little to the imagination, creativity, and initiative. Thus schools, in some sense, become ghettos and holding grounds for the (temporarily) superfluous. The solution of course lies in changed social arrangements. But the colleges can make a contribution by embodying a better life right on campus and by having students and faculty plan more actively for a better social future.

III. METHODS OF STUDY

Finally, I would like to say something about methods of research (in response to the invitation to include this in my presentation). In spite of a fairly ample literature concerned with the student in higher education, we do not have a sufficient range of data, we have

even less data that are oriented to policy purposes, and still less that deal with application of research to practice. Individual institutions themselves need to know much more about their students and they need to find out on a year-by-year, if not a month-by-month basis. Nothing in recent years dates more rapidly than information derived from research on college students.

There are many methods and procedures available for increasing our knowledge of the personal development of college students. Some standardized personality measures have been of great help. But I would like to confine myself here to a brief advocacy of greater utilization of the interview. The interview has three main virtues. (1) It is most sensitive to individuality and individual differences. (2) It is best able to ferret out the opinions and attitudes held by the person; it can get beyond the opinions one thinks one is supposed to hold; it even allows interviewees to articulate views they hold but had not articulated to themselves. (3) It can best avoid the imposition of categories of thoughts, held by the investigators, upon the respondents.

There is no substitute for the interview to get a full view of the quality of the intellectual and psychological development of people. It also is a prime instrument to determine the *processes*, as distinguished from the outcomes, of learning and development. Often we have good indicators of outcomes, but are woefully ignorant of how these outcomes were achieved.

The value of the interview can be much enhanced by the skills of the interviewer. But it is an instrument that should be more

frequently used by faculty in general to deepen their knowledge of students and educational processes. For instance, as modest an investment as interviewing the same one or two students at suitable intervals in each of their four college years would lead to gaining a more detailed view of their thinking processes and life space than faculty often possess. Everybody who teaches students ought to have this experience. (The interview method is most effective when the same person is interviewed several times. Experience seems to show that the third interview is the point when greater mutual confidence between interviewer and interviewee is established. Because the interview is such a revelatory instrument, it also carries the potential of some harm to the interviewee. Thus, people who come to it inexperienced ought to seek the guidance of sensitive professionals).

CONCLUSION

I conclude by repeating my central thesis. The psychological development of students needs to be more deliberately fostered both for its own sake and for the sake of providing the foundations for the development of mature intellectuality. Psychological and intellectual development are two aspects of a unitary capacity.

Comments at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education

March 7, 1976, Chicago, Illinois

A CONTEXTUAL MODEL FOR EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

by

C. Robert Pace

UCLA

One of the things that strikes me about the presentations of Dr. Bowen and Dr. Katz is how inapplicable our usual research models seem to be in relation to the social and personal benefits they have discussed. On the one hand, we have Howard Bowen's broad vision of reducing inequality in the society through education, a criterion for evaluating benefits that becomes apparent over decades of time rather than at the end of a course or the end of four years in college, one that reflects long range-planning and policy rather than some short-run instructional treatment. On the other hand, we have Joseph Katz's sensitivity to the potentials within the college experience for stimulating personal development toward higher levels of integration and independence, a development in which our analytical distinctions between the cognitive and affective become merged and interactive in a total personality. One is a social science focus on the state of society; the other is a clinical focus on the state of individual lives. Neither of these important and significant kinds of benefits can be usefully studied with experimental research models, manipulating variables, and partialling out backgrounds mainly because, so it seems to me, the criteria

themselves are not attainable or explainable by any single or isolated condition.

I don't have any patented alternative model guaranteed to satisfy researchers, administrators, and legislators alike; but I've been thinking about if for some time, and I do have some suggestions which depart radically from the common cause-and-effect research model. We could, for example, abandon the notion that it's necessary to control for student input in order to determine college impact. And we could abandon the concept of college impact, and think instead about student development and college impress. These heretical ideas have their origin in a clinical and developmental perspective rather than in a comparative, statistical perspective; and their relevance is for local institutional self-study rather than for national system-wide studies. In local studies there is no real necessity to have comparative data. The fact that students who come to the college are different from students who go to some other college is irrelevant. The local question is simply this: given the students who come here, what happens to them and what are they like when they leave?

In the input-environment-output model, the environment is the black box, the machinery which causes or explains differences in the student between arrival and departure. Suppose we turned this upside down and said that the environment is the input in the sense that it's what is there in the first place, the initial given. The college--its curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, policies, etc.--exists before the student comes to it. The question then is to learn how

students use the environment, how the nature and quality of what they do influences their own development, and how the environment presents opportunities and rewards for student responses.

I refer to this emergent model of mine as a contextual model for evaluating student development in college. The basic features of the model are suggested by the words: experience and events, environment, and effort, leading to development and impress. Now let me illustrate what I mean by these words.

Experience and Events

Experience consists of events.

Events have a quality as a whole.

This quality or meaning is the resultant of the interaction between the experiencer and the world, or physical event.

The meaning of an event, therefore, consists of the context which the experiencer brings to it and the context of the physical event.

The college experience consists of the events that occur in a college environment.

Since the experiencer is an integral and inseparable part of the meaning or quality of an event, the characteristics of the experiencer (knowledge, ability, personality, etc.) that are brought to bear on any given event are part of the event itself; and therefore psychologically it would seem unnecessary and perhaps inappropriate to treat student characteristics as "input" to be "partialled out" in research designs for studying "college effects."

So, the first major feature of a contextual model for studying college effects is to eliminate the separate treatment of variables that have heretofore been defined as student input.

Environment

The college environment consists of the events and experiences that occur in it, reflecting the purposes of the institution and how it functions.

These purposes and functions are revealed operationally by the clarity and strength with which they are perceived by the people who live in the environment, based on their experiences.

There are three basic types of dimensions that characterize and differentiate among college environments: a) personal development dimensions; b) relationship dimensions; and c) system maintenance and system change dimensions.

Personal development dimensions reflect the purposes of the institutions, that is, to afford opportunities for and give emphasis to the learning and development of students. There are four major lines of student development which are the concern, to a greater or lesser degree, of all colleges and universities: a) academic--scholarly--intellectual; b) esthetic--expressive--creative; c) critical--evaluative--societal concern and personal commitment; and d) vocational--occupational competence.

Relationship dimensions assess the extent to which individuals are involved in the environment, tend to support and help one another, and generate a sense of belonging. There are two major aspects that are

important and that can be differentiated: a) peer group relationships; and b) relationships between students and faculty, administrators, and other officials.

System maintenance and system change dimensions refer to how the institution operates as an institution; that is, to its bureaucratic--organizational--regulatory--and innovative features.

In most, and perhaps all but the most homogenous environments, the strength of these environmental dimensions or emphases will differ from one part of the environment to another--as between Engineering and Fine Arts, or between residents and commuters, for example--so that an adequate characterization of the environment of the college or university is one which permits differences to be revealed, if there are such, between major segments of the environment.

In addition, the potency of environments for influencing student development depends on certain qualities of and relationships among the various dimensions as well as on their separate strength. These qualities and relationships probably involve at least three further observations or measurements--intensity, pervasiveness, and congruence. Thus, a particular environmental dimension (events and experiences) may be typically intense or typically bland; it may be pervasive across time and place within the environment or it may be sporadic or localized; and the environmental emphasis felt in one part of the environment may be congruent or dissonant with the emphasis in another part of the environment.

So, the second major feature of a contextual model for studying college effects is the identification of the environmental contexts in which college events and experiences occur.

Effort and Exposure

With rare, and perhaps no, exceptions all learning and development in college involves some degree of effort on the part of the student. How much one learns depends on the effort made to learn it.

Effort, whether large or small in amount, also has a quality dimension. The quality of cognitive effort can range from low-level cognitive activities such as memorizing facts, principles, and terminology, to higher level cognitive activities of application, analysis, synthesis, and critical evaluation. The quality of affective effort can range from disinterest and indifference to more positive responses reflecting increasing levels of interest, enjoyment, and satisfaction. The quality of energy or behavior can range from passive to active, from silent spectator to active participant and public advocate.

Quality, like frequency, is a vertical dimension ranging from high to low. Activity scales, in which the response indicates frequency, but the content reflects levels of quality, can thus provide simultaneously a measure of amount and of quality. Such scales could be developed for different aspects of college experience--classroom learning, extracurricular activities, peer group conversations, etc.

Another dimension of effort is horizontal rather than vertical. This is the effort made to extend the range of events and experiences to which one is exposed. The word exposure is used to designate this additional dimension of effort.

So, the third feature of a contextual model for studying college effects is the identification of the quality of effort invested by the student in the educational enterprise. This feature is related to the

enlargement and enrichment of the context which the experiencer brings to the events encountered.

Development

The contextual base of the experiencer may be thought of as readiness to respond to the events and experiences of the college environment. The events and experiences then presumably enlarge the contextual base of the experiencer, enabling the student to respond to stimuli of increasing breadth, depth, and integration.

The extent and direction of this development or evolution is further influenced by the context of the environment in which events and experiences occur, plus the quality of effort invested by the experiencer.

Development, presumably following this general path, is inferred from the difference in scores on criterion measures at two points in time.

Impress

While impress, in the sense of making an impression on or leaving a mark on the student, can be inferred from differences between before and after status on relevant criterion measures, one can and, I think, should also regard impress as a personal feeling or belief on the part of the student. Thus impress would be inferred from self-reports of change and progress toward desired goals, benefits attributed to events and experiences, and expressions of satisfaction with college. Additionally, impress also implies a more lasting mark and hence would also

be measured after college by indications of continued interests, outlooks, concerns, etc. related to intellectual, esthetic, personal, social, occupational, and ethical criteria.

One of the virtues of this model or line of thinking, to me at any rate, is that it holds both the student and the college accountable. The student is accountable for the quality of investment or effort he makes in furthering his own learning and development; and the college is accountable for providing the events and the environmental context designed to stimulate learning and development.

In evaluating higher education we should not simply ask what does college do for the student, but also what does the student do with the opportunities which college presents.

If we ask both of these questions, and in relationship to each other, we will be focusing on the educative purposes of colleges and universities. We will still need, of course, better criterion measures to reflect these educative purposes, and we will need to devise new objective indicators of the nature and quality of the college experience. But given the needed instrumentation to do the job, I suspect that the accumulation of institutional case studies of student development and college impress will not only enhance our own understanding but will also help to demonstrate to a larger audience the educational effectiveness of many colleges and universities.